



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,284	10/01/2003	Steven Phillip Gologorsky	620-022US	7073
22897	7590	11/13/2009		
DEMONT & BREYER, LLC 100 COMMONS WAY, Ste. 250 HOLMDELE, NJ 07733				
EXAMINER				
ROBINSON, KITO R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3695				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/13/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@dblaw.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/676,284

Applicant(s)

GOLOGORSKY ET AL.

Examiner

KITO R. ROBINSON

Art Unit

3695

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This action is in reply to the amendment 30 June 2009.
2. Claims 1-20 have been amended.
3. Claims 1-20 are currently pending and have been examined.
4. The Examiner respectfully rescinds the 101 rejection to claims 1-10 & 11-20 in view of Applicant's arguments.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The Information Disclosure Statement filed on 07 April 2008 has been considered. An initialed copy of the Form 1449 is enclosed herewith.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments received on 30 June 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Referring to the previous Office action, Examiner has cited relevant portions of the references as a means to illustrate the systems as taught by the prior art. As a means of providing further clarification as to what is taught by the references used in the first Office action, Examiner has expanded the teachings for comprehensibility while maintaining the same grounds of rejection of the claims, except as noted above in the section labeled "Status of Claims." This information is intended to assist in illuminating the teachings of the references while providing evidence that establishes further support for the rejections of the claims.
2. With regard to the limitations of claim 1, Applicant argues "Nowhere does Nieboer nor Abdou teach or suggest, alone or in combination, what claim 1 recites, namely, publishing a relationship between a first bid variable and a second nonbid variable, and selecting a winning bid that is dependent on the first auction variable but independent of the second auction variable, and wherein the first auction variable

Art Unit: 3695

and the second auction variable become contract terms of a contract that result from the auction. For this reason, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 1 is traversed."

3. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The broadest reasonable interpretation of the term publishing is to make publicly known. Paragraph 0073 of Applicant's specification describes methods of publishing relationships by data network, telephone network, courier, and in person. The cited prior art Nieboer in Column 8, lines 28 & line 44 discloses "The ticker tape 102 allows users to view information within the system in a consistent and intuitive manner... The relationship of the order to the user will invoke a color-coding scheme on the user's terminal." Thus, the relationship of the orders is easily viewable to the users. Nieboer explicitly discloses *bid is dependent on the first auction variable and independent of the second auction variable* in Column 2, lines 34-40: "...where the price is the dependent variable of the algorithm within the constraints and the price of another item as an independent variable, the algorithm representing a buy or sell order". Nieboer does not explicitly disclose *selecting at the data processing system a winning bid in the auction*. However, Abdou in Paragraph 0038 discloses "The winning bid will be selected based upon various criteria, e.g., price, delivery schedule, reputation on quality, regulatory approval status, and/or any other specified requirements listed by the customer(s)". Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to [combine/modify] the independent variables of Nieboer with selecting the winning bids of Abdou because it is a quick and easy way of to "create an auction market instead of a negotiated market and will display prices to all participants and save the information for later use" (as taught in Nieboer). Nieboer explicitly discloses *wherein the first auction variable and the second auction variable become contract terms of a contract that results from the* in Column 2 lines 46-50: "at least one depicting prices of various items and contracts from external multiple data sources which may be used as variables of the algorithm or an input to a constraint variable."

4. With regard to the limitations of claim 4, Applicant argues "Claim 4 depends on independent claim 1, and Aggarwal fails to cure the deficiencies of Nieboer and Abdou with respect to claim 1. Therefore, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 4 is traversed."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees and points Applicant to the explanation of claim 1 above.

Art Unit: 3695

5. With regard to the limitations of claims 6-8, Applicant argues "Claims 6-8 depend on independent claim 1, and Williams fails to cure the deficiencies of Nieboer and Abdou with respect to claim 1. Therefore, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 6-8 is traversed."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees and points Applicant to the explanation of claim 1 above.

6. With regard to the limitations of claim 9, Applicant argues "Claim 9 depends on independent claim 1, and Business Wire fails to cure the deficiencies of Nieboer and Abdou with respect to claim 1. Therefore, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 9 is traversed."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees and points Applicant to the explanation of claim 1 above.

7. With regard to the limitations of claim 9, Applicant argues "Nowhere do Nieboer nor Abdou nor Kinney, alone or in combination, teach or suggest what claim 11 recites — namely, the relationship between the first auction variable and the second auction variable is such that a change in the first auction variable in a direction that is favorable to the auction solicitor induces a change in the second auction variable in a direction that is favorable to a bidder."

The Examiner notes Applicant refers to Kinney for the rejection, however the Examiner does not use the Kinney reference for claim 11. The Alaia reference is used in the rejection of claim 11, thus Applicant's arguments are moot in view of the rejection previously presented. With respect to claim 15-18 which dependent from claim 11 are also rejected using the same rationale as claim 11 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 3695

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
8. Claims 1-3, 5, 10 & 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Nieboer et al. US Patent Number US 6,418,419, hereafter Nieboer in view of Abdou US 2002/0107773, hereafter Abdou.

As per claim 1,

Nieboer discloses,

- *publishing from a data processing system a relationship between a first auction variable and a second auction variable (See Column 8, lines 28 & line 44: "The ticker tape 102 allows users to view information within the system in a consistent and intuitive manner... The relationship of the order to the user will invoke a color-coding scheme on the user's terminal")*.
- *wherein the first auction variable and the second auction variable become contract terms of a contract that results from the auction (see Column 2 lines 46-50: "at least one depicting prices of various items and contracts from external multiple data sources which may be used as variables of the algorithm or an input to a constraint variable")*
- *wherein the value of the second auction variable in the contract is based on the value of the first auction variable in the contract and the relationship between the first auction variable and the second auction variable (See Column 8, lines 60-65: "Generally, if a security derives its value from the price of the common stock in the symbol...or [LYX/LYO] where the first security is the security which derives its value in part from the value of the second security")*.

Furthermore, Nieboer discloses *bid is dependent on the first auction variable and independent of the second auction variable (see at least Column 2, lines 34-40: "...where the price is the dependent variable of the algorithm within the constraints and the price of another item as*

an independent variable, the algorithm representing a buy or sell order"). Nieboer does not disclose *selecting at the data processing system a winning bid in the auction*. However, Abdou in Paragraph 0038 discloses "The winning bid will be selected based upon various criteria, e.g., price, delivery schedule, reputation on quality, regulatory approval status, and/or any other specified requirements listed by the customer(s)".

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to [combine/modify] the method of Nieboer with the technique of Abdou because it is a quick and easy way of to "create an auction market instead of a negotiated market and will display prices to all participants and save the information for later use" (as taught in Nieboer).

As per claim 3,

Nieboer discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 1 above. Nieboer does not disclose the limitation of *first auction variable is delivery schedule and said second auction variable is price*. However Abdou in Paragraph 0038 discloses "The winning bid will be selected based upon various criteria, e.g., price, delivery schedule, reputation on quality, regulatory approval status, and/or any other specified requirements listed by the customer(s)."

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to [combine/modify] the method of Nieboer with the technique of Abdou because "it will create an auction market instead of a negotiated market and will display prices to all participants and save the information for later use" (as taught in Nieboer).

As per claim 5,

Nieboer discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 1 above. Nieboer does not disclose the limitation of *first auction variable is a measure of quality and the second auction variable is price*. However Abdou in Paragraph 0038 discloses "The winning bid will be selected based upon various criteria, e.g., price, delivery schedule, reputation on quality, regulatory approval status, and/or any other specified requirements listed by the customer(s)."

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to [combine/modify] the method of Nieboer with the technique of Abdou because "it will create an auction market instead of a negotiated market and will display prices to all participants and save the information for later use" (as taught in Nieboer).

As per claim 10,

Nieboer discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 1 above. Nieboer does not disclose the limitation of *the data processing system calculates the value of the second auction variable based on the first auction variable and the relationship for each bid as it is received, and makes available the value of the second auction variable for display to one or more bidders*. However, Abdou, in Paragraph 0010 discloses "a method and apparatus that provides an electronic commerce environment and the order is presented for bidding to a plurality of interested venders."

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to [combine/modify] the method of Nieboer with the technique of Abdou because "it will create an auction market instead of a negotiated market and will display prices to all participants and save the information for later use" (as taught in Nieboer).

9. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nieboer & Abdou in view of Alaia et al. US Patent Number US 6,199,050 B1, hereafter Alaia.

As per claim 2,

Nieboer & Abdou discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 1 above. Nieboer & Abdou does not disclose the limitation of *the relationship is such that a change in the first auction variable in a direction that is favorable to the auction solicitor induces a change in the second auction variable in a direction that is favorable to a bidder*. However, Alaia, in Column 7, Lines 53-61 discloses "With the time constraints on bidding, bidders wanted the ability to be able to rapidly adjust the lot price without specifically changing individual line items. Therefore, "pro

Art Unit: 3695

rata" bid adjustment was developed. With pro rata bid adjustment, bidders could change the total lot price quote, and the software would apportion pro rata the change across individual line items in the lot. However, a pro rata apportionment may result in individual items being priced at levels that are uneconomic for the bidder."

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to [combine/modify] the method of Nieboer & Abdou with the technique of Alaia because flexibility allows bidders to participate in the auction fully, and maximize the competitive nature of an auction (as taught by Alaia).

10. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nieboer & Abdou in view of Aggarwal et al. US 6,151,589 [Aggarwal '589].

As per claim 4,

Nieboer & Abdou discloses all limitations in claim 1 but does not disclose the following limitations. However, Aggarwal '589 discloses:

- *the first auction variable is time to complete and the second auction variable is price* (See Column 3 line 9-11).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to associate first & second variables of Nieboer & Abdou to the teachings of time completed and price of Aggarwal '589 so that the time intervals for the auctions are adjusted in such a way that auctions are not so slow, that buyer's timed bids are excluded (See Aggarwal Column 2, line 34-37).

11. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nieboer & Abdou in view of "Reviewing and Analyzing Service Contracts" by Kenneth Williams [Williams].

As per claim 6-8

Nieboer & Abdou discloses all limitations in claim 1 but does not disclose the limitations in claim 6-8. However, [Williams] teaches *the first auction variable is price and the second auction variable is warranty period* (See page 2). In Addition, Williams teaches *the first auction variable is*

Art Unit: 3695

price and the second auction variable is service contract price (See at least page 2) and the first auction variable is price and the second auction variable is service contract scope (See page 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine first & second variables of Nieboer & Abdou with the teachings of warranties and service contracts by Williams because it is an assurance by the vendor that the products or services are as represented or will be as promised.

12. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nieboer & Abdou in view of "Test Drive RFPHere.com Free for Three Months" by *Business Editors*.

As per claim 9,

Nieboer & Abdou discloses all limitations in claim 1 but do not disclose the following limitation.

However, *Business Editors* teaches:

- *the first auction variable is price and the auction variable is the provision of one or more articles free of charge (See page 2).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the first and second variables of Nieboer & Abdou with the teachings of price and articles free of charge by *Business Editors* because it provides companies to easily establish a presence on the Internet to sell their new, used, refurbished, and surplus products to businesses nationwide (See page 2).

13. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nieboer in view of Abdou in further view of Alaia.

As per claim 11,

Nieboer discloses,

- *publishing from a data processing system a relationship between a first auction variable and a second auction variable (See Column 8, lines 28 & line 44: "The ticker tape 102 allows users to view information within the system in a consistent and intuitive*

manner... The relationship of the order to the user will invoke a color-coding scheme on the user's terminal").

- *wherein the first auction variable and the second auction variable become contract terms of a contract that results from the auction (see at least Column 2 lines 46-50: "at least one depicting prices of various items and contracts from external multiple data sources which may be used as variables of the algorithm or an input to a constraint variable")*
- *wherein the value of the second auction variable in the contract is based on the value of the first auction variable in the contract and the relationship between the first auction variable and the second auction variable (See Column 8, lines 60-65: "Generally, if a security derives its value from the price of the common stock in the symbol...or [LYX/LYO] where the first security is the security which derives its value in part from the value of the second security").*

Furthermore, Nieboer discloses *bid is dependent on the first auction variable and independent of the second auction variable (see at least Column 2, lines 34-40: "...where the price is the dependent variable of the algorithm within the constraints and the price of another item as an independent variable, the algorithm representing a buy or sell order")*. Nieboer does not disclose *selecting at the data processing system a winning bid in the auction*. However, Abdou in at least Paragraph 0038 discloses "The winning bid will be selected based upon various criteria, e.g., price, delivery schedule, reputation on quality, regulatory approval status, and/or any other specified requirements listed by the customer(s)".

Nieboer & Abdou does not disclose the limitation of:

- *the relationship is such that a change in the first auction variable in a direction that is favorable to the auction solicitor induces a change in the second auction variable in a direction that is favorable to a bidder.*

However, Alaia, in Column 7, Lines 53-61 discloses "With the time constraints on bidding, bidders wanted the ability to be able to rapidly adjust the lot price without specifically changing

Art Unit: 3695

individual line items. Therefore, "pro rata" bid adjustment was developed. With pro rata bid adjustment, bidders could change the total lot price quote, and the software would apportion pro rata the change across individual line items in the lot. However, a pro rata apportionment may result in individual items being priced at levels that are uneconomic for the bidder."

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to [combine/modify] the method of Nieboer & Abdou with the technique of Alaia because flexibility allows bidders to participate in the auction fully, and maximize the competitive nature of an auction (as taught by Alaia).

As per Claim 19,

Nieboer Discloses:

- *the first auction variable is quantity and the second auction variable is price* (See Column 8, Lines 33-37: "These bids, offers and trades will include the following data elements relative to each: Security identification symbol; whether the order is a bid, an offer, or a trade; quantity; and price versus its related security price").

As per claim 20,

Nieboer, Abdou & Alaia discloses the limitation as applied to in claim 11 above. Nieboer & Alaia do not disclose the following limitation however Alaia does:

- *the data processing system calculates the value of the second auction variable based on the first auction variable and the relationship for each bid as it is received, and makes available the value of said second auction variable for display to one or more bidders* (See Para. 0010: Take note a method and apparatus that provides a electronic commerce environment and the order is presented for bidding to a plurality of interested venders).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to [combine/modify] the method of Nieboer & Abdou with the technique of Alaia because flexibility

Art Unit: 3695

allows bidders to participate in the auction fully, and maximize the competitive nature of an auction (as taught by Alaia).

14. Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nieboer, Abdou & Alaia in view of "Reviewing and Analyzing Service Contracts" by Kenneth Williams [Williams].

As per claim 15, 16 & 17

Nieboer, Abdou & Alaia discloses all limitations as applied to in claim 11 above but does not disclose the following limitations. However [Williams] teaches:

- *the first auction variable is price and the second auction variable is warranty period* (See page 2).
- *the first auction variable is price and the second auction variable is service contract price* (See page 2).
- *the first auction variable is price and the second auction variable is service contract scope* (See page 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine first & second variables of Nieboer, Abdou & Alaia with the teachings of warranties and service contracts by Williams because it is an assurance by the vendor that the products or services are as represented or will be as promised.

15. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nieboer, Abdou & Alaia in view of "Test Drive RFPHere.com Free for Three Months" by *Business Editors*.

As per claim 18,

Nieboer, Abdou & Alaia discloses all the limitations as applied to in claim 11 but does not disclose the following limitation. However, *Business Editors* teaches:

- *the first auction variable is price and the auction variable is the provision of one or more articles free of charge* (See page 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the first and second variables of Nieboer, Abdou & Alaia with the teachings of price and articles free of charge by *Business Editors* because it provides companies to easily establish a presence on the Internet to sell their new, used, refurbished, and surplus products to businesses nationwide (See page 2).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **KITO R. ROBINSON** whose telephone number is **(571) 270-3921**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Charles Kyle** can be reached on **(571) 272-6746**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Art Unit: 3695

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or **571-272-1000**.

/Kito R Robinson/
Examiner, Art Unit 3695

06/ November 2009

/Narayanswamy Subramanian/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3695